

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 17 2007****REMARKS**

Claims 13-28 are in this application with claims 13, 14, 19-22 are amended and claims 27-28 canceled herein. No new matter is added by this amendment.

In the office action, claims 13-28 are objected to for including the term "real-life." As pointed out by the Examiner this term is unnecessary to the claims as the devices of the present invention are capable of measuring items on a scale drawing and indicating to a user the "actual" dimension of the measurement using the inverse of the scale ratio. Accordingly, the term "real-life" has been removed from the claims. The office action also indicated two additional objections regarding claims 20 and 21. These claims have been amended to address these informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is requested.

On the merits, claims 21, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,484,395 to Samuels. The rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Contrary to the assertion in the office action, what has been alleged to be first and second indicia in Samuels, elements 18 and 16 are not in fact related by the inverse of the first scale as recited in claim 21. Element 18 has a scale of $\frac{1}{4}$ " - 1", while elements 16 have a scale of $\frac{1}{2}$ " - 1. It is submitted that these are not inverse of one another. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 21 and 24-26 distinguish over the relied upon portions of Samuels and are allowable. Claims 27 has been canceled, thus the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot.

Claims 13-23, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Samuels in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,314,408 to Shoemaker.

As discussed above, Samuels, contrary to the argument expressed in the office action does not depict two sets of indicia wherein the scale ratio of the second indicia is the inverse of the first indicia. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 13-23 patentably distinguish over the relied upon portions of the cited references and are allowable.


The method claims are distinguishable over the cited art for reasons that rest on the same foundation as those in the presently claimed device.

All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider

this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action. Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathan Weber
Reg. No. 50,958
212.940.8564

Attorney Docket No.: ERDF 22.464 (335981-00001)
Customer Number: 026304